REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

Claims 1-3, 5-18, and 20-21 remain pending in the application.

Claims 4 and 19 have been cancelled.

Claim 21 has been added.

Support for new claim 21 can be found at least in paragraphs [0036]-[0039].

Claims 5 and 8 have been amended to be dependent on new claim 21.

Claims 1-3, 15-18, and 20 stand previously withdrawn for consideration.

No new subject matter has been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 4-6 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) for being obvious having regard to Schrenk et al. (US 4,091,550) in view of Kalley (US 7,129,706).

Schrenk et al. teach a computer-aided system for teaching a student to trouble-shoot a piece of equipment, such as a radio receiver, with a tester, such as a volt-ohm meter. The system taught by Schrenk et al. includes a simulated piece of electronic equipment 10, a simulated piece of test equipment 140, a data processor 180, a display and keyboard unit 200, and a software system used in combination with the data processor (col. 3, lines 35-41).

Kalley teaches a method for testing an automobile battery comprising a step of acquiring battery identification information.

New claim 21 recites a "system for providing operation, diagnostic, procedure or maintenance training" comprising a "simulation server adapted to receive a probe event and to send a feedback according to said probe event". The Applicant submits that no mention or suggestion of a "simulation server" is made in Schrenk et al. The display and keyboard unit 200, taken alone, is not a computer, and the data processor 180 is the only processor mentioned in Schrenk et al. The data processor 180 and the display and keyboard unit 200 comprising a cathode ray tube display 202 and a conventional keyboard input 204 (col. 6, lines 6-8) are all part of a same computer or machine, which corresponds to the single computer. This computer or machine is only in communication

with the simulated piece of electronic equipment 10 and the simulated piece of test equipment 140. If the data processor 180 is said to read on the "host computer" recited in claim 21, then the Applicant submits that the "simulation server" is not taught or suggested by Schrenk et al. In the alternative, if the data processor 180 is said to read on the "simulation server" recited in claim 21, which the Applicant disagrees with, then Schrenk et al. fail to teach or suggest a "host computer". Therefore, Schrenck et al. fail to teach or suggest a system comprising a "simulation server adapted to receive a probe event and to send a feedback according to said probe event". Furthermore, the Applicant submits that Kalley also fails to teach or suggest a "simulation server adapted to receive a probe event and to send a feedback according to said probe event", as recited in new claim 21.

As the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of new claim 21, new claim 21 is believed to be compliant with 35 USC 103(a).

The Applicant submits that claims 5 and 6 are also compliant with 35 USC 103(a) since they dependent on new claim 21.

Claim 7 is rejected for being obvious having regard to Schrenck et al. in view of Kalley and Krauss et al. (US 2002/0191363).

Claim 8-14 are rejected for being obvious having regard to Schrenck et al. in view of Kalley and Fordham et al. (US 5,067,901).

Claims 7 and 8-14 are believed to be compliant with 35 USC 103(a) since they depend on new claim 21.

Conclusions

The Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard P. Bauer/
Richard P. Bauer
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,588

PATENT ADMINISTRATOR
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
2900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20007-5118